UNITED
NATIONS

CCPR

International covenant on civil and political rights

Distr.
GENERAL

CCPR/C/SR.1778
20 December 1999

ENGLISH
Original: FRENCH

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE

Sixty-sixth session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1778th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 28 July 1999, at 10 a.m.

Chairperson: Mr. AMOR

later: Ms. MEDINA QUIROGA

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

PROPERTY OF

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued)

1. The CHAIRPERSON invited the members of the Committee to adopt the revised version of the draft consolidated guidelines for State reports under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR/C/GUI/2/Rev. 1). The draft had been prepared by Lord Colville.

2. Lord COLVILLE, introducing the draft, said he hoped that the Committee would rapidly reach a consensus on the wording of the various paragraphs, so that the text could be adopted before the end of the current session and included in the Committee's annual report. He drew particular attention to paragraph A.2, which provided that the guidelines would be effective for all reports to be submitted three months from their publication. The proposed date in brackets (October 1999) could be changed, the important point being that the guidelines should be adopted as soon as possible and that the Committee should decide on a date of publication. He also drew attention to section H, entitled "Format of the report", which had not existed in the earlier versions. The various sections were indicated by a letter, and divided into paragraphs preceded by the letter of the section followed by a figure listing the paragraphs.

3. Ms. GAITAN DE POMBO said the word "refundidas" in the Spanish text of the title was unsuitable and should be replaced by a more appropriate term.

Section A. "Introduction"

Paragraph A.1

4. The CHAIRPERSON said that, in the French text, the word "annulée" should be replaced by "abrogée".

Paragraph A.4

5. Ms. CHANET suggested that, in the French text, the first part of the sentence should be amended to say that application of the guidelines would reduce the demand for further information.

6. Section A, as orally amended, was adopted.

Section B. "Framework of the Covenant concerning reports"

7. Section B, as orally amended, was adopted.

Section C. "General guidance for contents of all reports"

Paragraph C.1. "The articles and the Committee's General Comments"

8. Mr. POCAR suggested that the word "should" should be replaced by "must", which was more emphatic and hence more appropriate.

9. Mr. Pocar's suggestion was adopted.

Paragraph C.3 "Derogations"

10. Mr. SCHEININ said that the wording of that paragraph might give the impression that the Committee was interested only in the legitimacy of derogations, whereas it was important to know what rights might be restricted under the derogations. States parties should therefore be requested also to indicate the effects of derogations.

11. Mr. LALLAH suggested that, at the end of the paragraph, words should be added stating that relevant information should be provided in relation to each article of the Covenant affected by the derogation.

12. The suggestions by Mr. Scheinin and Mr. Lallah were adopted.

Paragraph C.6 "Discrimination" and paragraph C.7 "Problems of the types referred to in C.4 to C.6 above"

13. Ms. CHANET suggested that the two paragraphs should be deleted as being confusing and of little use.

14. Mr. LALLAH said that paragraph C.6 mixed the question of discrimination and the question of minority rights; the Committee must, in fact, take care to make a clear distinction between them.

15. Mr. BHAGWATI supported the suggestion to delete paragraph C.6, which, in his view, was unnecessary since the question of discrimination was necessarily taken up in State party reports under the implementation of article 27 of the Covenant.

16. Lord COLVILLE said he did not oppose the deletion of paragraphs C.6 and C.7, but recalled the Committee's view that it was important for all State party reports to contain statistics on the situation of women.

17. Ms. EVATT considered that the Committee's future general comment concerning article 3 of the Covenant would give clear indications on the question of the equality of the sexes. Pending its adoption, however, the Committee could agree on the text of a new paragraph, to replace paragraphs C.6 and C.7, in which it would request statistics on the situation of women.

18. Mr. POCAR, endorsing Ms. Evatt's suggestion, considered that the question of equality between men and women, to which one article of the Covenant was devoted, might be the subject of a specific paragraph in which the Committee would say that that question must be dealt with in all State party reports.

19. The Committee should approach the question of statistics in general terms, without going into detail. States parties should simply be asked to provide all relevant statistics for the purpose of the consideration of their reports.

20. The CHAIRPERSON said he was not opposed to the deletion of paragraphs C.6 and C.7, but considered it important to indicate in the guidelines that States parties must provide statistics in their periodic reports.

21. Lord COLVILLE agreed with the Chairperson and observed that the statistics presented orally to the Committee by State party representatives during the consideration of a report were of little value. In his opinion, it should be stated that reports must contain all relevant statistics, particularly on the question of equality between men and women. However, if the Committee wished to extend the request to other areas, he would endorse its decision.

22. Mr. YALDEN supported Lord Colville's suggestion, but observed that reports were often prepared a long time before their consideration by the Committee and the statistics they contained were accordingly obsolete. Consequently, arrangements should be made to enable States parties to submit additional statistics, which should furthermore be circulated to Committee members sufficiently in advance to enable them to take them into account when considering the report.

23. Ms. EVATT, supported by Mr. BHAGWATI, said that the text of the guidelines could not possibly solve all the problems arising from the submission of State party reports. The Committee could simply say that reports must contain statistics and sufficient data to enable it to assess the human rights situation and progress with regard to respect for the rights of women and minorities.

24. Mr. LALLAH said that he would prefer there to be no specific mention of the rights of women and minorities, since the Committee was also interested in other statistics, for example statistics on the number of persons sentenced to death, executions, etc. It would therefore be better to ask, in more general terms, for statistics on the implementation of the relevant articles of the Covenant.

25. Lord COLVILLE said that the point raised by Mr. Yalden was dealt with in section G.5 ("Extra information"); in his view, it was difficult to see what better solution the Committee could adopt at the present time.

26. Mr. ANDO considered that it would indeed be advisable to draft a new paragraph to replace paragraphs C.6 and C.7, in which the Committee would request States parties to include in their reports all relevant statistics on the implementation of the provisions of the Covenant, including statistics relating to the situation of women and minorities.

27. Mr. BHAGWATI considered it important that States parties should systematically provide statistics on the situation of minorities relating, in particular, to their representation in public life, education, etc.

28. The CHAIRPERSON observed that the question of equality between men and women arose in all cases, regardless of the State party concerned, unlike the question of minority rights which, in some States, was almost if not completely irrelevant.

29. Ms. CHANET said she took a less trenchant view. Although the question of minority rights did not arise systematically, unlike the question of equality of the sexes, it nevertheless arose very frequently. She suggested that general wording should be retained and that States parties should be asked to provide statistics, when available, on all relevant articles of the Covenant.

30. Lord COLVILLE, summarizing the points on which a consensus seemed to be emerging, said that paragraphs C.6 and C.7 would be deleted and replaced by two new paragraphs. In the first, the Committee would say that the question of equality of rights between men and women should be specifically dealt with in all State party reports. In the second, it would say that the reports should include sufficient data or statistics to enable it to assess progress in the enjoyment of Covenant rights, wherever those were appropriate.

31. It was so decided.

32. Section C, as orally amended, was adopted.

33. Ms. Medina Quiroga took the Chair.

Section D. "The initial report"

Paragraph D.1 "General"

34. Mr. POCAR suggested that the word "principal" should be deleted from the second subparagraph.

35. Mr. KRETZMER considered that, since the question was a particularly sensitive one, it would be better to follow the actual wording of the Covenant and amend the second line of the third subparagraph to read: "rights by all individuals within the territory of the State party and subject to its jurisdiction".

Paragraph D.2 "The core document"

36. Ms. CHANET, Lord COLVILLE, Ms. EVATT, Mr. ANDO, Mr. LALLAH and Mr. POCAR, discussing the advisability of attaching to the core document the degree of importance given to it in paragraph D.2, said that it was a unique document which States parties were called upon to prepare for all the treaty bodies; its role in the preparation of the initial and subsequent reports of States parties was fairly secondary. They agreed to adopt the solution proposed by Ms. Evatt: no separate mention should be made of the core document; the text should go directly from paragraph D.1 to paragraph D.2.2, which referred to an essential article of the Covenant, article 2; at the end of paragraph D.1, there should simply be a short paragraph reminding States parties that some essential information might already be contained in the core document, to which reference might simply be made in the report.

Paragraph D.3 "Contents of the initial report"

Paragraph D.3.1

37. Mr. KRETZMER said the second clause of the paragraph should be amended to ensure that the State party fully understood that what the Committee was interested in was not only the legal norms, but the practical situation and the actual availability of remedies.

38. Ms. CHANET considered that the words "it is not sufficient to describe the legal norms", which presupposed the existence of such norms and their description in the reports, was not positive enough.

39. Lord COLVILLE, taking account of the observations just made, proposed the following wording: "Legal norms should be described, but that is not sufficient. The situation in fact, the practical implementation and effect of rights, and the availability of remedies for violations of them should be described".

Paragraph D.3.2

40. Lord COLVILLE considered it unnecessary to retain the text in square brackets. He proposed that the beginning of the paragraph should be amended to read "The report should explain", the rest of the paragraph being unchanged.

41. Mr. SCHEININ considered that, in the first subparagraph, it would be preferable to replace the term "self-executing", a concept which certainly did not exist in all countries, by the words "directly applicable", which was more widely used.

42. Ms. CHANET suggested that the word "protected" in the third subparagraph should be replaced by "guaranteed".

43. Mr. LALLAH inquired about the meaning of the words in brackets in the last subparagraph.

44. Lord COLVILLE said that those words could be deleted.

45. Paragraph D.3.2, as orally amended, was adopted.

Paragraphs D.3.3 and D.3.4

46. Paragraphs D.3.3 and D.3.4 were adopted.

Paragraph D.3.5

47. Mr. POCAR, speaking on behalf of several members of the Committee who considered that paragraph to be unnecessary, requested that it should be deleted.

48. Ms. EVATT, supported by Lord COLVILLE, proposed that the Committee should define in a few lines at the end of section C the role it wished core documents to play.

49. The CHAIRPERSON said she thought she was correctly interpreting the view of the Committee in saying that paragraph D.3.5 should be deleted, but that there would be a reference to core documents at the end of section C.

Paragraph D.4 "Annexes to the report"

50. Lord COLVILLE explained that he had written the word "NOTE" in capital letters because he had particularly wanted to draw the State party's attention to what followed. But he agreed that the word could be deleted.

51. Section D, as orally amended, was adopted.

Section E "Subsequent periodic reports"

Paragraph E.1 "Contents of periodic reports"

52. Lord COLVILLE said he had tried to make it very clear in that section that henceforth periodic reports must be based essentially on the most recent concluding observations of the Committee and must conform to a precisely defined framework. For that reason, he had asked States parties to devote full attention to the concluding observations, the summary records, and each article of the Covenant on which they should specify the extent to which citizens could exercise the rights established therein.

Paragraphs E.1.1 and E.1.2

53. Ms. EVATT, supported by Mr. ANDO, asked whether the first subparagraph of paragraph E.1.1 constituted an alternative and whether it would not be better to say that the two starting points for the reports were the concluding observations "and", and not "or", the summary records.

54. Mr. POCAR, also supported by Mr. ANDO, suggested that in the second subparagraph the word "examination" should be replaced by "description".

55. Mr. BHAGWATI considered that States parties should be requested to inform the Committee of the situation at the time of drafting the report with regard to the enjoyment of their rights by persons within their jurisdiction.

56. Ms. EVATT considered that it would be advisable to recall that in article 40 of the Covenant States parties were requested to inform the Committee of "progress made", the important word being "progress"; the reports must also give information on the "current" situation.

57. Ms. CHANET, referring to an earlier decision by the Committee on the need to make the concluding observations on the preceding report, in conjunction with the previous subjects of concern and recommendations, the starting and finishing points of State party reports, felt that it would be possible to merge into a single paragraph paragraphs E.1.1 and E.1.2, which it was difficult to differentiate. The Committee would retain the second and third subparagraphs of paragraph E.1.2, which would come after the first subparagraph of paragraph E.1.1, so that States parties would be requested to take account in their reports of the concluding observations, summary records, concerns and recommendations expressed by the Committee, and information previously requested or given, and then to describe any changes which had occurred since the preceding report, as stated in the second subparagraph of paragraph E.1.2. On the other hand, she found the second subparagraph of paragraph E.1.1 completely unnecessary.

58. Mr. POCAR unreservedly supported that proposal, but considered that the words "of every sort" in the second subparagraph of paragraph E.1.2 were unnecessary. He proposed that the subparagraph should be amended to read "changes which have occurred since consideration of the previous report", since a certain period of time could elapse between the submission and consideration of a report, and a report should inform the Committee of the action taken on the recommendations it had made after considering the previous report.

59. Lord COLVILLE proposed that paragraph E.1.2 should be deleted and that paragraph E.1.1 should be reworded as suggested by the various speakers on the subject.

60. It was so decided.

Paragraph E.1.3

61. Summarizing an exchange of views between Mr. POCAR, Lord COLVILLE and herself on whether the whole of the paragraph was necessary, the CHAIRPERSON said she took it that only the first part should be retained ("Periodic reports should, therefore, be structured so as to follow the articles of the Covenant").

Paragraph E.1.4

62. After an exchange of views in which Mr. BHAGWATI, Ms. CHANET, the CHAIRPERSON and he himself took part on the means of eliminating excessively complicated references to other paragraphs in the text, Lord COLVILLE proposed that paragraph E.1.4 should be amended to read: "The State party should consider the guidance on initial reports and give effect to it so far as is necessary for a subsequent report."

63. Lord Colville's proposal was adopted.

Paragraph E.1.5

64. Mr. POCAR said he was shocked by the words "approach to Covenant rights" in the first subparagraph.

65. Lord COLVILLE said that the purpose of that subparagraph was to draw countries' attention to the need for an article-by-article report when they had undergone radical changes in ideological terms - for example, if they had moved from a communist regime to a market economy.

66. Mr. LALLAH proposed the following wording, in the light of Lord Colville's explanation: "There may have occurred a fundamental change in the political or legal order affecting the enjoyment of Covenant rights. In this case, a full article-by-article report may be required".

67. Mr. Lallah's proposal was adopted.

68. Ms. CHANET suggested that, in the second subparagraph, the word "legal" should be replaced by "legislative". She further suggested, with support by Mr. LALLAH, that the third subparagraph should be deleted.

69. Ms. Chanet's suggestions were adopted.

70. Section E, as orally amended, was adopted.

Section F. "Optional protocols"

Paragraph F.1

71. Lord COLVILLE said that, at the end of paragraph F.1 the following words should be deleted: "taking account of the Committee's General Comment"; they had been included in error.

72. In response to concern expressed by Mr. POCAR, who wanted the content of the Views referred to in paragraph F.1 to be specified, Lord COLVILLE proposed the following wording: "If the State party has ratified the Optional Protocol and the Committee has issued Views entailing the provision of a remedy or expressing any other concern relating to a communication ...".

73. Lord Colville's proposal was adopted.

74. Section F, as orally amended, was adopted.

Section G. "The Committee's consideration of reports"

Paragraph G.1 "General"

75. Summarizing an exchange of views between Lord COLVILLE, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LALLAH, Ms. EVATT, Mr. AMOR, Mr. POCAR and Mr. BHAGWATI, the CHAIRPERSON said that the first two sentences of paragraph G.1 would be deleted and the remaining sentence would be reworded by Lord Colville so as to mention the Committee's commitment in the process of improving the rights situation in the State party.

Paragraph G.2 "List of issues"

76. Following critical comments by Mr. SOLARI YRIGOYEN, the CHAIRPERSON said that the Committee would draw the attention of the services concerned to the problem of quality of translations.

77. Mr. SCHEININ proposed that the State party should be recommended to prepare a list of 10-15 replies and to keep its oral presentation to 60-120 minutes.

78. Mr. BHAGWATI, supported by Mr. KLEIN, considered that the question of the use of time was very important, but it was inappropriate to take it up in the guidelines. He proposed that the second sentence of paragraph G.2 should be deleted.

79. Mr. AMOR said that, since the use of time was indeed an important question, there should be a minimum of guidance on the question in paragraph G.2 dealing with the list of issues. He accordingly proposed including a sentence stating that the total discussion time should as far as possible be divided equally between the State party delegation and the Committee. Secondly, on the question of the delegation sent by the State party to introduce the report and reply to questions, he thought it was unnecessary to remind the State party that it should appoint a high-level delegation competent to reply to questions; that was obvious and, in any event, a State acted as it saw fit.

80. Thirdly, he was personally very embarrassed by the length of time between the State party's submission of its report and the time when that report was considered by the Committee. The Committee should take action vis-à-vis the services concerned and exert appropriate influence to ensure that that situation was terminated or at least became a bit more tolerable. For that reason, he proposed saying that the Committee should, as far as possible, consider at the earliest possible time the reports submitted by States and that it was incumbent on the relevant editing and translation services, and the secretariat, to take the necessary action to that end. It was embarrassing for the Committee to press States parties to submit their report within a certain time limit if it then made them wait several years before considering them.

81. Ms. GAITAN DE POMBO supported Mr. Klein's observations on the three subjects dealt with, and particularly on the use of time. Unlike Mr. Amor, she thought that it was the responsibility of the Chairperson to inform the State party delegation, on its arrival, of the time available for the oral presentation of the report and then to draw its attention to the relevant constraints in the course of the subsequent explanations. In her opinion, that should not be laid down in writing in the guidelines.

82. Mr. ANDO shared the concern expressed by Mr. Amor, Mr. Klein and Ms. Gaitan de Pombo. Perhaps a new heading should be created to refer to the constraints on the consideration of State party reports, since they had increased in number while the number of meetings which the Committee was able to devote to them was limited. In those circumstances, the Committee should exercise self-discipline by not sending the State party an excessively long list of issues, members should not repeat the same questions, and the cooperation and understanding of the State party should be sought in order to make the best possible use of the time available, following the instructions given by the Chairperson.

83. Mr. POCAR proposed a compromise solution whereby the following words would be added to the second sentence of paragraph G.2: "within the time limits available for the consideration of the report". That would make it possible to mention the question of time constraints, which would have to be spelled out by the Chairperson.

84. The CHAIRPERSON, speaking in a personal capacity, said she had learned from her experience within the Committee that it was sometimes simply impossible to ask the State party delegation to take less time because Committee members asked a host of questions, they all wanted to have replies to their questions and they sometimes asked new questions. The Committee was in the process of trying to organize its work in the best possible manner. Mr. Pocar's proposal seemed to her to be acceptable since it did no more than draw attention to the problem.

85. Lord COLVILLE said that he could accept Mr. Pocar's proposal without any difficulty, and reminded members that the guidelines were intended for State parties, and not the Committee or the United Nations system.

86. Paragraph G.2, with Mr. Pocar's amendment, was adopted.

Paragraph G.3 "The State party's delegation"

87. Mr. SOLARI YRIGOYEN suggested that the wording of the second sentence might be slightly amended to say that the State party delegation should be composed of "persons who, through their rank and competence, had a thorough knowledge", the rest of the sentence remaining unchanged. The idea was to avoid delegations being composed of lower-ranking officials from permanent missions, who always had to consult their mission before replying to the Committee's questions.

88. Lord COLVILLE said that he found that suggestion very useful and proposed wording to the effect that delegations should include persons who, by their knowledge of and competence to explain the human rights situation in their country, were able to respond to the Committee's written and oral questions.

89. Paragraph G.3, as revised by Lord Colville, was adopted.

Paragraph G.4 "Concluding observations"

90. Ms. EVATT, after a comment by Mr. ANDO, proposed that in the first sentence of the paragraph the word "issue" should be replaced by "publish" and that in the second sentence "published" should be replaced by "included".

91. Paragraph G.4, as orally amended, was adopted.

Paragraph G.5 "Extra information"

92. Lord COLVILLE observed that the paragraph was divided into several parts, as follows: G.5.1, subparagraphs (a) and (b), and G.5.2; obviously, the time limit mentioned in paragraph G.5.1 (a) should be 10 weeks and not 10 months. In addition, subparagraph (b) of paragraph G.5.1 was completely new.

Paragraph G.5.1

93. Ms. EVATT emphasized two factors which must be taken into consideration in connection with any addenda a delegation might provide at the time of its presentation, i.e. after the submission of its report, in order to bring it up to date. First, the lists of issues were in most cases now prepared at the session preceding that at which the State party report would be considered. Secondly, the 10-week time limit mentioned in paragraph G.5.1 (a) enabled the secretariat to distribute the document in question several weeks before the session at which the report would be considered. Subparagraph (b) concerned the case of an addendum submitted a short time before the session, which was possible if it was already translated into the three working languages mentioned. If it was not translated, the addendum should be submitted one month before the session.

94. Lord COLVILLE, responding to a comment by Mr. LALLAH, said that the addenda referred to in the paragraph under consideration must have been translated by the State party in the case referred to in subparagraph (b), since the resources available to the Committee would not enable it to have that translation done in such a short time.

95. Mr. ANDO observed that, out of consideration for States parties whose language was a United Nations working language other than English, French or Spanish, the wording of subparagraph (b) should be slightly amended to say that the text must have been translated into the Committee's three working languages, "which were currently English, French and Spanish".

96. Mr. POCAR supported that suggestion.

97. Ms. CHANET agreed, and observed that, in her opinion, it was completely illusory to make such a request since States parties which provided an addendum to update their reports did so at the very last minute.

98. Mr. SCHEININ said that the excessively peremptory tone of the paragraph should be somewhat mitigated by saying, for example, that if one of those conditions was not fulfilled, the Committee would not be able to take the addendum fully into consideration.

99. Mr. YALDEN agreed with Ms. Chanet and thought that subparagraph (b) might be deleted, in the light of Mr. Ando's observations.

100. Mr. AMOR, referring to the problem arising from addenda submitted by delegations at the last minute, proposed saying that the text must have been translated into three or all of the United Nations working languages.

101. Mr. KLEIN considered that States parties could not reasonably be asked to translate any updates into all the working languages; such documents might in fact be useful to the Committee even if they were submitted in a single language.

102. Ms. EVATT recalled that the discussion concerned any addenda submitted by a delegation after the submission (and not introduction) of the report; they were in fact revisions or updates of the report proper, and not annexes, which the Committee accepted without requesting their translation. That distinction having been made, she proposed that the text of paragraph G.5.1 should be amended to read: "Following the submission of the report, any subsequent revisions or updatings of the reports submitted by States parties cannot be considered by the Committee unless they are:

(a) Submitted no later than 10 weeks prior to the date set for the Committee's consideration of the report (the minimum time required by the United Nations translation services); or

(b) Provided in the working languages of the Committee, which are currently (the rest unchanged)". Then there would be a last sentence stating that that did not apply to the usual annexes to the reports. Lastly, it was unnecessary to mention the Working Group or any other procedure forming part of the Committee's current working methods.

103. Mr. POCAR supported the wording proposed by Ms. Evatt and thought that mention might also be made of statistics or any other document containing data which the Committee could take into account without a translation.

104. Lord COLVILLE agreed to Ms. Evatt's proposal, which had the advantage of solving the problem raised by Mr. Scheinin while at the same time warning States parties of the constraints which the Committee must take into account.

105. The CHAIRPERSON noted that the Committee was ready to adopt the text of paragraph G.5.1, as amended.

106. Paragraph G.5.1, as amended, was adopted.

107. Mr. KLEIN referred to a situation where an invited State party did not attend and where the Committee asked another State party, at very short notice, to present its periodic report in lieu of the missing State party. Would the rules just adopted apply with equally strict effect?

108. The CHAIRPERSON replied that that would be an exceptional case and would be treated as such.

Paragraph G.5.2

109. Lord COLVILLE pointed out that that paragraph covered cases where a delegation announced that it would provide further information, which reached the secretariat too late to be taken into account in the text of the Committee's concluding observations and which must accordingly be included in the State party's following report.

110. Paragraph G.5.2 was adopted.

Section H. "Format of the report"

111. Lord COLVILLE said that that paragraph was purely practical in nature and concerned the secretariat of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, which dealt with the reproduction, translation and distribution of documents.

112. Section H was adopted.

113. The CHAIRPERSON warmly congratulated Lord Colville on the work he had done and the patience he had displayed; he deserved the Committee's deepest thanks.

114. Ms. CHANET, reverting to a point relating to section A and more specifically paragraph A.1, said it should be specified, by indicating their symbols, which were the different earlier versions of the guidelines adopted by the Committee that had now become obsolete and been replaced by the new guidelines. In her opinion, the various versions should be listed.

115. Lord COLVILLE said that he would take Ms. Chanet's observations into account when he came to finalize the current version with its various amendments. He had also envisaged including a text containing guidelines relating to the special reports which the Committee sometimes requested.

116. The CHAIRPERSON raised the question whether it was not preferable, for that purpose, to wait until the Committee with its current membership reconsidered the guidelines in question, which would subsequently be appended to the new consolidated guidelines. On that point, she invited the Committee to resume and complete the consideration of the draft consolidated guidelines (CCPR/C/GUI/2/Rev.1) at the following meeting.

117. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.